

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated April 20, 2010. Claims 20 and 23 to 38 are currently pending in this application. Claims 36 to 38 were previously withdrawn. Claim 20 is in independent form and has been amended by this response. No new matter has been entered. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in FIG. 1 and in paragraphs 0013-0014. Enclosed is a Request for Continued Examination and a One-Month Extension of Time to reply to the Office Action. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for all payments due in connection with this Response.

The Office Action rejected Claims 20, 23 to 27, 31, 32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,606,722 to Haimi-Cohen ("Haimi-Cohen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,357,204 to Knoll et al. ("Knoll"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and traverses, such rejections.

Independent claim 20 as currently recited includes, among other elements, "using the voice decoder with error concealment disabled to forward a pulse code modulation signal to a cellular text demodulator." Haimi-Cohen and Knoll, alone in combination, fail to teach this feature.

In Haimi-Cohen, a reverse CRC signal sets a Baudot present flag 316 to indicate that the signal being received is Baudot code and not voice. Error concealment is performed by the speech decoder subcircuit 306 even when the Baudot present flag 316 is set. Haimi-Cohen simply ignores the output of the speech decoder subcircuit 306 when the Baudot present flag 316 is set. Knoll teaches the disabling of individual subcircuits when not in use. Combining the teachings of Haimi-Cohen and Knoll would produce a system that disables the speech decoder subcircuit 306 when the Baudot present flag 316 is set. However, this would result in no speech decoding during that time.

In stark contrast, the present invention continues to use "the voice decoder with error concealment disabled to forward a pulse code modulation signal to a cellular text demodulator." Haimi-Cohen and Knoll, alone in combination, fail to teach this feature.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 20 is patentably distinguished over Haimi-Cohen and Knoll and is in condition for allowance. All other pending claim depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 20 and are also

allowable for the reasons given with respect to Claim 20 and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY 

James F. Goedken
Reg. No. 44,715
Customer No. 29177

Dated: August 20, 2010